

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

See
Cp.

11956
SU35433

Cop. 2

SUGAR REPORTS

U. S. DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

1963
IRREGULAR SERIAL RECORDS

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. JANUARY 1963 NO. 129

<u>CONTENTS</u>	<u>PAGES</u>
1. MARKET REVIEW	2 - 4
2. SUGAR AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE -- Address by Under Secretary of Agriculture Charles S. Murphy	5 - 13
3. (a) ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS RELATING TO SUGAR SUPPLIES for 1963	14 - 15
(b) OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS	15 - 16
4. STATISTICAL SERIES	17 - 31
(a) Highlights	17
(b) Supply and Disposition Summary: January-November 1962	18
(c) Disposition and stocks: January-November 1962 and 1961 To end December 1962 and 1961	19 19
(d) Mainland Production and Quota Charges: January-November 1962 and 1961	20
(e) Refiners and Importers receipts by Source of Supply: January-November 1962 and 1961	20
(f) Status of Quota and Balance as of December 31, 1962 and January 17, 1963	21 - 23
(g) Deliveries by States: November 1962 to end November 1962 and 1961	24 25 - 26
(h) Deliveries by type of product or business of buyer, third quarter 1962, with comparisons: (1) Sugar (Revised) (2) Corn sirup and Dextrose	27 - 28 29
(i) Sugar Prices by Areas	30
(j) Refined sugar production and stocks	31
5. REFERENCE GUIDE TO SUGAR REPORTS PUBLISHED DURING 1960, 1961 and 1962	32 - 37

MARKET REVIEW

The resumption of the longshoremen's strike at Atlantic and Gulf ports on December 23, 1962 found the refiners with larger than normal inventories of sugar. However, demand increased during the strike and supplies of most refineries affected by the port stoppage were low when the strike ended on January 25. Approximately 175,000 tons of raw sugar were in ports ready for unloading so that all refineries will be able to resume normal operations.

As a result of high world prices the Department on January 23 announced that the import fee on foreign sugar would be zero for at least three weeks. Thereafter, the quantity of global quota previously authorized for purchase and importation was quickly oversubscribed; on January 31 an additional 350,000 tons were authorized and immediately thereafter fully subscribed. This brings to 1,100,000 tons the total global quota authorized for entry by September 30, 1963. These actions were taken for the purpose of increasing supplies and maintaining stable prices to domestic consumers. Prior to the January 23 action the import fee had been 1.40 cents per pound for global quota sugar and 0.28 cent for country quota sugar from foreign countries other than the Philippines. The spot price of raw sugar on January 23 was 6.72 cents per pound or 0.17 cent above the 6.55 cent price consideration indicated by the Sugar Act.

As a result of the dock strike and rising prices, deliveries for U. S. consumption during the period January 1-19 totaled 480,000 tons or 36 percent above deliveries for the same period last year. Refiners deliveries totaled 391,000 tons, up 119,000 tons from those of last year for the same period.

On December 26, 1962, the first business day after the resumption of the dock strike, wholesale refined sugar prices advanced 0.10 cent per pound in all areas except in the Eastern beet territory where the price quotations declined 0.20 cent. Effective December 28 another 0.10 cent increase was effective in all territories except in the Southeast and the Eastern beet territories. The increase of 0.10 cent was effective in the Southeast on January 7, 1963. A further increase of 0.15 cent was effective in all territories, except the Far West and Eastern beet, on January 15. As of January 22, the following prices were in effect:

	<u>Cane</u>	<u>Beet</u>
	cents per lb. in 100-lb. bags	
Northeast	10.05	
New York Metropolitan area	9.95	
Southeast	9.55	
Gulf	9.35	
Eastern Beet		8.95
Chicago-West	9.55	9.35
Chicago Switching District (dlv'd)	9.95	9.75
Lower Pacific Coast	9.40	9.40
Northwest	9.20	9.20
Mountain States	9.30	9.20

The spot price of domestic raw sugar at New York was 6.72 cents per pound from January 14 through January 22, 1963. This was an increase of 0.17 cent from the price that prevailed before the dock strike at Atlantic and Gulf ports. The wholesale refined price for the Northeast territory increased 0.35 cent during the same period.

The world sugar market started 1963 with a strong upsurge. Spot prices for world raw sugar, f.o.b. and stowed Caribbean ports rose 0.80 cent in the first 21 days of January. The spot price, as quoted by the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange under the No. 8 Contract, rose from 4.80 cents per pound on January 2 to 5.60 cents per pound on the 21st. Quotations for March futures, during the same period, advanced from 5.00 cents to 5.73 cents. On January 21 May and July futures were quoted at 5.67 cents. Trading in No. 8 Contract futures was heavy and averaged over 64,000 long tons per day (1,285 contracts) during the January 2-21 period. This is over five times the average daily rate of trading in 1962 (12,736 tons).

The surplus of recent years appears to have been liquidated so that the carryover into 1963 was smaller than usual. Production of beet sugar

in Europe was significantly lower than in recent years. Production of leading Caribbean countries does not reach its maximum until March.

Cuban production, the former balance wheel, is a matter of great uncertainty. Cuba has already sold around half a million tons of sugar for 1963 delivery to free countries. Her deliveries to Communist countries in 1963 will thus be considerably less than the 4,860,000 metric tons (5,357,000 short tons) which were to be exported to Communist countries each year according to announcements made in October 1961. Both the size of the Cuban crop and the division of its distribution between communist and free countries are therefore of concern to the market.

In this connection, the declining tonnage of sugar exports from Communist countries (including Cuba) to free countries is noteworthy. In 1959, Cuba and other Communist countries exported 5.7 million metric tons to free countries; in 1960 they supplied free countries a total of 4.4 million tons, and in 1961 a total of 3.5 million tons. Incomplete data for 1962 account for 2.4 million tons and the final figure is likely to be less than 3.0 million tons.

The January 26, 1963 issue of the Soviet newspaper *Izvestiya* reported Soviet sugar statistics for the calendar year 1962 which we compare with corresponding data for the three preceding years:

	<u>1962</u>	<u>1961</u>	<u>1960</u>	<u>1959</u>
	<u>million metric tons, white sugar</u>			
Total sugar production (incl. sugar refined from Cuban raws)	7.8	8.4	6.4	6.0
Beet sugar production	6.0	6.1	5.3	6.0
Sugar refined from Cuban raws	1.8	2.3	1.1	0
	<u>million metric tons</u>			
Sugar beet deliveries to factories ("procurements")	43.9	47.7	52.5	41.4
Sugar beet production for sugar	47.2	50.9	56.5	43.9
Sugar beet production for feed	22.9	13.3	not reported	

SUGAR AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Address by Under Secretary of Agriculture
Charles S. Murphy, before the Sugar Club,
New York City, Monday, December 17, 1962

When my good friend, Irv Hoff, asked me to speak to you, I was delighted because of the very important relationships which we in the Department of Agriculture have with the sugar industry. I welcomed this opportunity to get to know you better.

Then your President told me of the very keen interest this group has in international trade generally -- as well as in the world of sugar. This makes me doubly glad to be here because it gives me an opportunity to talk about something that is very high on the current priority list of our Department -- a matter of utmost importance to our whole nation, and one that is far too little understood. I refer to the importance of agriculture to international trade. I wish to tell you of the critical importance this subject has come to have in the whole fabric of Free World unity and strength. The entire relationship of the United States to the European Common Market, and the relationship of the Common Market to other free nations, has come to depend to an extraordinary degree upon finding solutions for problems of agricultural trade.

But before going into that, I do want to tell you of the pleasure I had in working with representatives of the sugar industry on the new sugar legislation last spring and summer. I received at that time a very intensive indoctrination in certain aspects of your industry. It was, I can assure you, a very interesting experience; and one which I believe came to a reasonably satisfactory conclusion. Perhaps no one is altogether happy with the outcome -- or can afford to admit it if he is. However, we do have a Sugar Act, and it is working. There may be a little creaking in the machinery here and there -- the Act does present to us in the USDA some new and not altogether simple problems -- but it is working.

In fact, the Sugar Act is working so well that the American Farm Bureau does not dare to attack it; and when you can say that about any farm law, that's a very, very high compliment.

Actually, we think the new Act will be very effective in helping us to accomplish our major goal in sugar legislation -- which is, of course, to secure a stable and dependable supply of sugar at prices that are fair to U. S. producers and reasonable to U. S. consumers. During the last few months, we have operated under the two novel provisions of the 1962 Amendments: the so-called global portion of the Cuban quota and the variable import fee.

I believe that we have now had enough experience with these provisions to say that they do work. All sugar exporting countries with which we are in diplomatic relations and which have most-favored-nation status can now compete to supply a substantial portion of our sugar requirements. From the viewpoint of supply assurance, which is of particular interest to sugar consumers, much needed flexibility is added to our system. During the last half of this year, the global quota sugar on which the full fee was paid balanced the arrival schedules of refiners during periods when quota sugar was not being offered in sufficient quantities. It is my understanding that the mechanics for paying the fee, for earmarking quantities within the global quota, and for fixing the amount of the fee far enough in advance to accommodate the variety of commercial transactions which are prevalent in the sugar trade, have been worked out to the satisfaction of the merchants and other principals in sugar transactions.

I believe the global quota provision, by significantly broadening the market for world sugars, has contributed substantially toward the welfare of the countries of the world which depend upon sugar exports for a large part of their foreign exchange.

During the last two years, sugar production has been lagging behind world consumption rates. This is understandable in view of the low prices which have prevailed for world market sugars in recent years and the effects of political developments in some producing countries. Broadening the market for such sugar will tend to bring stability to the international market and to relieve the stress created by special sugar trading arrangements of a number of countries including, of course, the United States.

I do wish to commend your industry for the reasonable and rational basis on which it approached the matter of obtaining new legislation, and to express my pleasure for the opportunity I had to work with the industry's representatives in that regard.

Now, if I may turn to the subject of agriculture in international trade, I would like first to give you a few facts and figures.

The United States, as we all know, has a tremendously productive agricultural plant, and from that plant we are exporting about 15 percent of the production. This compares with about 8 percent of our non-farm production sold in foreign markets. For the year ending June 1962, agricultural exports reached a record total of \$5.1 billion. This is one-fourth of all the exports from the United States. We are the world's largest exporter of farm products.

During the past five years, the aggregate value of our exports of agricultural commodities exceeded our imports of such commodities by \$5.4 billion, and this amount is on the credit side of our balance of payments ledger.

We have consistently exported more competitive agricultural products than we have imported. This fact eloquently attests to the efficiency of American farm production. There are some who suggest that this balance is maintained through the use of extensive import controls on these competitive products. Let me correct this erroneous notion.

We have been fairly generous in past trade negotiations in granting access to our markets for competing agricultural products. These concessions have been granted in exchange for concessions we have obtained from other countries on our exports, often industrial exports. The results add up to a liberal trade policy on our part with respect to agricultural imports.

Import controls limiting the quantity which foreign suppliers can sell in the U. S. market are applied today on only five agricultural commodities -- cotton, wheat and wheat flour, peanuts, certain manufactured dairy products, and sugar. Moreover, the domestic production of all these commodities, except dairy products, is restricted. All other agricultural imports of the U. S., which include fresh and frozen beef and lamb, pork, a large variety of canned meat products, vegetable oils, fruits and vegetables, tobacco, and even feed grains, are permitted unrestricted entry and are subject to only moderate tariffs.

It is sometimes suggested that a more extensive use of export subsidies would substantially increase our agricultural exports and result in a significant contribution to meeting our balance of payments difficulties. We have used export subsidies primarily where needed to maintain our fair share of the world trade in certain commodities. We now make export payments on a limited number of products. We feel that if used indiscriminately, export subsidies could not only seriously disrupt orderly international trade, but could also endanger our balance of payments condition. Any undue disruption of trade patterns might bring about retaliatory measures not only against the subsidized product, but against our industrial exports as well. We are following, and propose to continue to follow, a responsible course in agricultural trade. We also feel that we should be able to expect our major trading partners to do the same.

It is dollar exports -- trade with the so-called developed countries, and particularly with the Common Market--that I would now like to discuss. In fiscal year 1962, Canada, Japan, and the U.K. were grouped closely together as the leading individual export markets for our farm products. Each bought about \$500 million worth of agricultural products. Also in 1962, as a group, the six members of the Common Market bought about \$1.2 billion of U. S. agricultural commodities out of total U.S. dollar exports of \$3.5 billion.

The rapid rate of growth and the booming economy of the Common Market, attributable no doubt in large part to its developing economic unity, have afforded us increased potential outlets for our farm production. Prosperity in Western Europe has brought increased demand for meat, poultry, milk and eggs -- a demand that has expanded livestock and poultry numbers. We foresee that as the economy of this area becomes more prosperous, there will be an ever-increasing demand for food and fiber. However, there is a grave question as to who will be allowed to supply this increasing demand -- and, indeed, as to whether the U.S. and other third countries will not have the doors of historic trade closed in their faces.

The prospects for a continued outlet for our agricultural exports will be determined in large part by the evolving Common Agricultural Policy of the EEC. We are disturbed by the mounting evidence that this policy will be regressive and trade-restrictive. We have been urging that the Common Market develop its Common Agricultural Policy along lines consistent with the maintenance of international trade. By this we mean

that it should formulate its agricultural policies so as to maintain a level of international trade consistent with principles of fair competition having due regard to its position as a major importer of agricultural commodities and a major exporter of industrial products. Such a policy is not only required in the interest of fairness to friendly agricultural exporting countries, such as the United States, but in the interest of the Common Market itself.

Industrialization in Western Europe has historically been aided by the importation of moderately priced agricultural and other raw materials from outside the area. Its industries as well as its consumers have greatly benefited from this practice. We want to see it continued. The formation of the Common Market has ushered in a new period of economic growth which can be continued and even accelerated if its consumers and its factories continue to have access to moderately priced agricultural imports.

Our hopes for liberal trade policies are being realized on some products. These are the products which the Common Market does not produce at all, or produces in small volume. These include cotton, soybeans and soybean meal, tallow, hides and skins, certain fruits and vegetables, and some other farm products. These commodities represent about \$700 million worth of our farm products shipments to the area. For these products, the EEC proposes to apply a fixed common external tariff. The prospects are bright that our exports of these products as a group will expand as that trading area expands. However, even for these commodities, trade is not entirely free of problems. For some products, the duties are still high.

For the remainder of our current trade with the Common Market, amounting to nearly \$500 million, we are concerned over the future prospects. This includes our trade in wheat and wheat flour, feed grains, certain meat products, poultry, eggs, and rice. The reason for this concern is the emphasis placed by the EEC's common agricultural policies on variable levies and minimum import prices rather than on fixed tariffs. This levy system is designed to make possible unlimited protection to domestic production and can readily be used for the deliberate purpose of achieving self-sufficiency.

It should be entirely clear that there is a vital difference between the import fee system we have for sugar and the Common Market's variable levy system. This difference is that we have guaranteed exporting

nations a very substantial part of the U.S. sugar market -- about 40 percent -- and a share that is in line with past trade history. This is an extremely important contribution to keeping open the channels of agricultural trade -- and one which was not accomplished cheaply or easily. There are a plenty of battle scars in this room that will attest to that fact.

We have no reason to be ashamed of the liberality of our import policies for agricultural products. If the EEC would only do for the world's wheat what we have done for the world's sugar -- that is to keep its doors open for a share of the market in line with past history -- that would be a responsible and satisfactory solution of this very difficult problem.

The first Community-wide regulations for agricultural commodities went into effect on July 30, 1962. The regulations for wheat, flour, feed grains, poultry, eggs, and pork--all items of important trade interest to the United States -- establish variable levies to replace the previously existing tariffs and other trade regulating mechanisms. These levies will vary from time to time and to the extent necessary not only to equalize the price of the imported products with the EEC's internal domestic prices but also to afford a price preference for the marketing of domestic production. Domestic prices, most of which are already high, will be fixed by government action. Under this system, a non-member supplier -- no matter how efficient he may be -- can never get a price advantage over the domestic producer when the variable levy is applied. It is the purpose of this device to equalize the cost of imports with the predetermined level of internal prices. EEC producers will be guaranteed a market for all they can produce at the price levels fixed by the governmental body. The pressures for high internal prices will be great. The use of this system to maintain high internal target prices could provide a powerful stimulus to uneconomic production and a substantial decrease of imports.

Wheat, flour, feed grains, and poultry products account for most of the value of the U.S. exports that will be affected by the variable import levy system. In the marketing year 1961-62, our exports to the EEC of wheat and flour were \$121 million; feed grains, \$271 million; and poultry and eggs, \$67 million. Trade data now available do not enable an evaluation of the impact of this system on our trade in wheat and feed grains since its adoption on July 30. Due to the over-protection afforded by this system, our trade in flour has virtually disappeared. There has

been a substantial slowing down of our sales of poultry and egg products since July 30. This is due primarily to the application of levies and minimum import prices which has resulted in an import charge of about 12-1/2 cents a pound on poultry by West Germany, our major market, in place of a duty of about 5¢ per pound charged before July 30.

The combined value of these exports approaches \$500 million. The loss of any substantial part of this would have a serious effect upon our balance-of-payments position.

A comparison of import charges -- where valid comparisons are available -- clearly shows the extent of the increase in levels of protection for those commodities about which we are especially concerned. The following table illustrates selected examples of import levies in major markets for certain commodities before and after the Common Agricultural Policy became effective:

Commodity	Import Levies (Dollars per M. T.)			
	Netherlands		Germany	
	Prior to July 1	After July 30	Prior to July 1	After July 30
Wheat <u>1/</u>	3.19	33.25	42.50	61.25
Wheat flour	14.50	49.60	-	-
Corn	16.67	18.63	46.05	55.20
Barley	16.67	21.03	35.69	49.40
Sorghums	16.67	21.07	45.84	55.15
Poultry	-	- <u>2/</u>	4.5 - 5.0	12.5 <u>3/</u>

1/ Fortified by mixing regulation (35% domestic--65% imported);
mixing regulation no longer in effect under CAP (after July 30, 1962).

2/ Cents per pound.

3/ Levy of 9.7 cents per pound plus gate price differential of 2.8 cents per pound.

You can readily see how these radically increased burdens on U. S. exports could play havoc with existing trade patterns.

The amount of our trade threatened by the Common Agricultural Policy would be increased if the U.K. should become a member of the EEC. In fiscal 1962, our agricultural exports to the U.K. were about \$500 million. If the variable levy system of the Common Market were applied to the United Kingdom, it would affect \$130 million worth of those exports to the U.K. of grains and certain livestock products.

We have had numerous discussions with Common Market officials and pointed out that under their levy system, the key element is that of the level of prices set by the Community. We have urged that they demonstrate their declared intentions of following a liberal trade policy in agriculture by establishing moderate price levels for their grain products. This would retard expansion of uneconomic production and permit trade with efficient producers to continue.

There has been increasing emphasis by Community officials in these discussions on the need for international commodity arrangements to deal with some of these troublesome agricultural trade problems. On our part, we believe that international commodity arrangements merit consideration, if they are designed to preserve legitimate trade patterns. We are willing at the proper time to seek to negotiate such arrangements. We have indicated our desire that a meeting be called early in 1963 under the auspices of the GATT in an attempt to negotiate a grain agreement. Our objectives as an exporting nation would be to maintain reasonable access to the Common Market. This might be accomplished by any one or a combination of several methods, including maximum limits on variable fees and assured import quotas.

We do not look upon commodity agreements as a substitute for normal rules governing world trade in farm products. Trade in the widest possible range of agricultural commodities and food stuffs should continue to be regulated by conventional means of moderate fixed tariffs, tariff quotas and limits on levies. We firmly believe that the international trade rules for agriculture should not be permitted to drift away from the rules which apply to international trade generally. In other words, countries should seek to carry out their trade policies in accordance with the provisions of the GATT, which apply to industry and agriculture alike.

We propose to insist upon fair treatment.

We have built into the fabric of highest U.S. policy a determination to preserve reasonable access to the Common Market for our agricultural products. For many months we have been expressing through diplomatic channels and publicly our apprehensions about the emerging EEC agricultural policies. Secretary Freeman, on November 19 before the Agricultural Ministers of the OECD in Paris, expressed these apprehensions most vigorously.

"We cannot," the Secretary said, "be internationally-minded in industrial areas of our respective economies, but nationalistic and overly-protective in the agricultural sector. Either the two great sectors must move forward together under liberal trade arrangements, or both will in time succumb to protectionism."

Under Secretary of State Ball repeated this U.S. policy the following week in Paris at the OECD meeting of Foreign Ministers.

It is only within such a framework that we will be able to use the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to promote more liberal trade arrangements. We have a mandate by the Congress to use this Act to gain access for our agricultural commodities. This is evident from the provisions of Section 252.

It will be a great pity if Common Market officials fail to recognize that the trading countries of the free world will not permit agricultural trade to retreat behind high tariffs and protective devices. The expanded EEC would be a dominant factor in world trade in agricultural products. Friendly countries should be able to look to it to assume a proper position of responsibility and set a trade example which their trading partners can follow. These countries, as equally concerned as the United States over their agricultural trade with the expanded Community, are looking for U.S. leadership in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the Trade Expansion Act. There is an increasing awareness that if this Act turns out to be a meaningless instrument in the field of agricultural trade, and the Common Market persists in providing excessive added protection for its own agricultural programs at the expense of outside suppliers, the consequences for all of us could be very serious, indeed.

ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS RELATING TO SUGAR SUPPLIES FOR
1963

Continuation of Sequence following Sugar Act Amendments in July 1962

Two supply actions have been taken since the last Sugar Reports went to press, details of which are shown below:

A. Sugar Import Fee Reduced to Zero: (January 23, 1963)

The U.S. Department of Agriculture today reduced the sugar import fee to zero and assured importers that the fee would not be raised above that level during the next three weeks. The action was taken for the purpose of increasing supplies and maintaining stable prices to domestic sugar consumers.

Along with removal of the import fee the sugar import program has been modified as follows:

1. Sugar import regulations (Sugar Regulation 817) have been revised to permit importers to apply for reservation of import quotas (i.e. for set-aside) for specified quantities of global quota sugar on condition that such sugar shall be shipped from the country of origin within 200 days and imported into the United States on or before Sept. 30, 1963. There now remain for such authorization approximately 636,000 tons of global quota sugar from the quantity of 750,000 tons made available Dec. 7, 1962. (The regulations continue to require that sugar imported under country quotas be shipped within 110 days and imported within 155 days after the date of application for set-aside.)

2. During the period the import fee remains at zero all applications for set-aside must be accompanied by a statement that the importer owns or controls the sugar and will within three days of the date of application submit an irrevocable letter of credit in the amount of one-half cent per pound of sugar authorized for set-aside. The letter of credit will be cancelled when the importation occurs or will be drawn upon as liquidated damages in case of non-performance.

Today's action results, USDA officials said, from the increase in world prices to more than double the level of a year ago and the resulting rise in domestic prices to a level above that contemplated by the Sugar Act.

The price of raw sugar, duty paid New York, at the close of business on Jan. 22 was 6.72 cents per pound or 0.17 cent above the level of 6.55 cents per pound which the Secretary of Agriculture must take into consideration in determining domestic sugar requirements. The world spot price on the same date was quoted at 5.60 cents per pound.

B. Global Sugar Quota Increased (January 31, 1963)

The U. S. Department of Agriculture today announced an increase of 350,000 tons in the quantity of sugar authorized for purchase and importation by Sept. 30, 1963, from foreign countries as a group (global quota).

With this increase the total global quota authorized for purchase and importation is 1,100,000 tons, leaving a balance of 404,341 tons not authorized from the total quota of 1,504,341 tons withheld from Cuba.

On Jan. 23, 1963, when the sugar import fee was reduced to zero (USDA Press Release 237-63) there was an unused balance of 636,000 tons in the then existing global quota of 750,000 tons. Immediately following the reduction in the import fee, applications for quota clearance and quota reservation were received by the Department for a quantity of sugar to be imported within the global quota substantially in excess of the unused balance of 636,000 tons.

The increase announced today will permit approval of the applications which could not be approved within the previously authorized global quota of 750,000 tons.

OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

Date announced

Nature of action

December 21
1962

Allotment to processors of the direct-consumption portion of the mainland sugar quota for Puerto Rico for the calendar year 1963. These allotments limit the quantity of Puerto Rican direct-consumption sugar that may be brought into the continental United States by each allottee. (See December 29, 1962 Federal Register).

<u>Date announced</u>	<u>Nature of action</u>
December 27, 1962	Announcement of a public hearing on fair and reasonable wage rates and prices for the 1963 crop of sugar beets in California. Hearing dates Jan. 15, 1963 in Forest Service Room 539, Appraisers Building, 630 Sansome Street, San Francisco, Calif., beginning at 10 a.m. (See January 3, 1963 Federal Register).
January 2, 1963	Established 1963 sugar requirements and quotas for local consumption of 50,000 short tons, raw value, for Hawaii and 130,000 tons for Puerto Rico. This action makes effective, without change, as of Jan. 1, 1963, the requirements and quotas set forth in a Notice of Proposed Rule Making issued on Dec. 10, 1962. (See January 5, 1963 Federal Register).
January 7, 1963	Revision of the definition of a farm as applied under the Sugar Act to sugarcane farms in Puerto Rico. The definition applies to the 1962-63 and subsequent sugar crops. This revised definition conforms closely with the proposal made to the industry in the Federal Register Notice of Sept. 21 (press release USDA 3331-62) except that the proposed maximum charge for management services of 2-1/2 percent of the grower's share of receipts from sugar and molasses is increased to 12-1/2 percent, as recommended by a group representing the Puerto Rican industry and supported by available economic data. (See January 10, 1963 Federal Register).

Corrections in article "SIXTY YEAR IN SUGAR,"
December 1962 Sugar Reports, No. 128

- Page 6: Last paragraph, fourth line, fifth word should be "Michigan" instead of "Washington;"
- Page 9: Right hand column, add "1902-51 Mount Clemens, Michigan" between the second and third lines;
- Page 13: First complete paragraph, sixth line, tenth word should be "Defoe" instead of "Defore;"
- Page 25: First paragraph, fifth line in () should be "succeeded by"instead of "successor to".....

STATISTICAL SERIES IN THIS ISSUEHIGHLIGHTS

1. December 1962 sugar deliveries for continental U.S. consumption, 786,000 short tons, raw value (preliminary) up about 13,000 from November 1962 and up 36,000 tons from December 1961. January-December 1962 deliveries 9,712,000 short tons, raw value, up about 101,000 tons from the January-December 1961 period. Final data for December 1962 deliveries 773,000 -- previously published preliminary as 778,000 tons.

2. Primary distributors' stocks December 29, 1962 were 2,219,525 short tons, raw value (preliminary) up 24,000 tons from a year earlier and up 326,000 tons from end November 1962. During December beet processors' stocks increased by about 359,000 tons, and importers of direct-consumption stocks by about 5,600 tons; refiners' stocks decreased by about 6,500 tons, and mainland sugarcane processors' stocks by about 32,000 tons.

3. Charges to quotas calendar year 1962 were 9,791,981 short tons, raw value.

4. Regionally, January-November deliveries, 1962 as compared with 1961, were up to 3 regions and down to 2 -- Increases: Western 3.2 percent, South 0.5 percent. Middle Atlantic 0.4 percent, Decreases: North Central 0.4 percent; New England 1.1 percent.

Table 1 - Sugar supply and disposition by primary distributors, January-November 1962

(Short tons, raw value)

Item	Beet proc- essors	Importers	Main- land cane proc- essors ^{1/}	Refiners		Net total
	(1)	(2)	(3)	Raw (4)	Refined (5)	(6)
SUPPLY						
1. <u>Inventory Jan.1, 1962</u>	1,268,555	61,944	23,105	596,246 <u>2/</u>	245,411 <u>2/</u>	2,195,261
2. <u>Production and movement</u>						
a. Received as direct- consumption sugar	0	273,430	0	0	5,741	279,171
b. Produced from beets or cane	1,963,662	0	399,071	50,182	38,234)	2,106,570 <u>3/</u>
Less deliveries to refiners	0	0	344,579	0	0)	
c. Receipts of raws by refiners	0	0	0	6,367,777 <u>4/</u>	0)	- 124,979 <u>5/</u>
Less raws melted	0	0	0	6,492,756	0)	
d. Refined from raws melted	0	0	0	0	6,454,270	6,454,270
e. Adjustments	231	2	- 159	- 200	- 353	- 479
f. Sub-total	1,963,893	273,432	54,333	- 74,997	6,497,892	8,714,553
3. <u>Net total supply</u>	3,232,448	335,376	77,438	521,249	6,743,303	10,909,814
DISPOSITION						
4. <u>Distribution for</u>						
a. Quota purposes	2,189,943	288,107	25,594	5,107	6,417,578	8,926,329
b. Export	0	1,238	0	0	56,634	57,872
c. Livestock feed	0	26,942	0	0	5,576	32,518
d. Sub-total	2,189,943	316,287	25,594	5,107	6,479,788	9,016,719
5. <u>Inventory November 30, 1962</u>	1,042,505	19,089	51,844	516,142 <u>6/</u>	263,515 <u>6/</u>	1,893,095
6. <u>Total distribution and inventory</u>	3,232,448	335,376	77,438	521,249	6,743,303	10,909,814

^{1/} Establishments that acquire no raw sugar from others for refining. Processor-refiners are included with refiners.

^{2/} Includes Mainland cane sugar not charged to quota: Raws, 36,694; Refined, 29,689; Total, 66,383.

^{3/} Production less deliveries of raw sugar to refiners.

^{4/} Includes 356,182 received from Mainland cane processors.

^{5/} Receipts of raw sugar by refiners less melt.

^{6/} Includes mainland cane sugar not charged to quota: Raws, 23,631; Refined, 20,974; Total, 44,605.

Table 2 . - Distribution of sugar by primary distributors, January-November 1962 and 1961

Item	1962	1961	Change 1961 to 1962
Short tons, raw value			
Continental United States			
Refiners' raw	5,107	9,115	- 4,008
Refiners' refined	6,479,788	6,159,532	+ 320,256
Sub-total	6,484,895	6,168,647	+ 316,248
Beet processors' refined	2,189,943	2,414,131	- 224,188
Importers' direct consumption	316,287	323,726	- 7,439
Mainland sugarcane processors'	25,594	36,827	- 11,233
Total	9,016,719	8,943,331	+ 73,388
For: Export	57,872	51,567	+ 6,305
Livestock feed	32,518	30,840	+ 1,678
Continental consumption 1/	8,926,329	8,860,924	+ 65,405
Puerto Rico		101,871	
Hawaii		39,895	

1/ Includes deliveries for United States Military forces at home and abroad.

Table 3 . - Stocks of sugar held by primary distributors in the continental United States, November 30, 1962 and 1961

Item	1962	1961	Change 1961 to 1962
Short tons, raw value			
Refiners' raw	516,142	371,860	+ 144,282
Refiners' refined	263,515	257,105	+ 6,410
Sub-total 1/	779,657	628,965	+ 150,692
Beet processors' refined	1,042,505	988,465	+ 54,040
Importers' direct consumption	19,089	48,986	- 29,897
Mainland sugarcane processors'	51,844	42,013	+ 9,831
Total	1,893,095	1,708,429	+ 184,666

1/ Included mainland cane sugar not charged to quota: 1962 - Raws, 23,631; Refined, 20,974; Total, 44,605; 1961 - Raws, 16,054; Refined, 26,325; Total, 42,379.

Table 4 . - Distribution of sugar by primary distributors in the continental United States, December and January-December 1962 and 1961

Item	1962 1/	1961	Change 1961 to 1962
Short tons, raw value			
Refiners	530,868	7,015,763	529,491
Beet processors' refined	225,053	2,414,996	193,035
Importers' direct consumption	14,619	330,906	10,045
Mainland sugarcane processors'	15,000 2/	40,594	21,978
Total	785,540	9,802,259	754,549
For: Export	N. A.	57,872	3,819
Livestock feed	N. A.	32,518	725
Continental consumption 3/	785,540	9,711,869	750,005

1/ Preliminary. 2/ Estimated. 3/ Includes deliveries for U. S. military forces at home and abroad.

Table 5 . - Stocks of sugar held by primary distributors in the continental United States, December 29, 1962 and December 31, 1961

Item	1962 1/	1961	Change 1961 to 1962
Short tons, raw value			
Refiners' raw	516,183	596,246	- 80,063
Refiners' refined	256,937	245,411	+ 11,526
Sub-total	773,120	841,657	- 68,537
Beet processors' refined	1,401,763	1,268,555	+ 133,208
Importers' direct consumption	24,642	61,944	- 37,302
Mainland sugarcane processors	20,000 2/	23,105	- 3,105
Total	2,219,525	2,195,261	+ 24,264

1/ Preliminary. 2/ Estimated.

Table 6 . - Mainland sugar: Production and quota charges, January-November 1962 and 1961

Item	1962	1961	Change 1961 to 1962
Short tons, raw value			
<u>Production</u>			
Mainland cane	485,200	511,805	- 26,605
Domestic beet	1,963,893	1,904,725	+ 59,168
Total	2,449,093	2,416,530	+ 32,563
<u>Quota charges</u>			
Mainland cane:			
Louisiana sugarcane processors			
For further processing	186,290	236,090	- 49,800
For direct-consumption	18,295	27,651	- 9,356
Louisiana processor-refiners	108,066	108,984	- 918
Florida sugarcane processors	164,740	129,327	+ 35,413
Sub-total	477,391	502,052	- 24,661
Beet processors	2,189,943	2,414,131	- 224,188
Total	2,667,334	2,916,183	- 248,849

Table 7 . - Sugar receipts of refiners and importers by source of supply 1/ January-November 1962 and 1961

Source of Supply	Raw sugar		Direct-consumption sugar		Total	
	1962	1961	1962	1961	1962	1961
Short tons, raw value						
<u>Offshore</u>						
<u>Foreign</u>						
Dominican Republic	823,251	358,481	15,940	27,268	839,191	385,749
Mexico	389,083	579,161	8,504	9,200	397,587	588,361
Peru	493,922	508,450	5,196	10,886	499,118	519,336
Philippines	1,106,836	1,200,370	42,742	44,818	1,149,578	1,245,188
Other countries	1,405,330	1,213,550	54,197	65,641	1,459,527	1,279,191
Sub-total	4,218,422	3,860,012	126,579	157,813	4,345,001	4,017,825
<u>Domestic</u>						
Hawaii	1,021,830	998,801	5,741 <u>2/</u>	0 <u>2/</u>	1,027,571	998,801
Puerto Rico	756,813	820,199	146,851	144,315	903,664	964,514
Virgin Islands	10,750	5,495	0	0	10,750	5,495
Sub-total	1,789,393	1,824,495	152,592	144,315	1,941,985	1,968,810
Total offshore	6,007,815	5,684,507	279,171	302,128	6,286,986	5,986,635
Mainland cane area	406,364	379,854	38,234 <u>3/</u>	50,197	444,598	430,051
Acquired for reprocessing and samples	3,786	5,989	0	0	3,786	5,989
Grand total	6,417,965	6,070,350	317,405	352,325	6,735,370	6,422,675

1/ Includes sugar as detailed in Table 8. 2/ Refined sugar received by refiners. 3/ Refined sugar produced direct from cane by processor-refiner.

Table 8 . - Receipts of quota-exempt and over-quota sugar included in Table 7 .

Purpose	Refiners		Importers		Total	
	1962	1961	1962	1961	1962	1961
Short tons, raw value						
For: Export	62,063	43,616	7,415	5,336	69,478	48,952
Livestock feed	8,066	1,502	40,171	44,244	48,237	45,746
Later release						
Bonded	0	5,000	0	0	0	5,000
In customs custody	0	0	101	5,998	101	5,998
Total	70,129	50,118	47,687	55,578	117,816	105,696

Table 9. - Status of 1962 quotas and charges as of December 31, 1962

Area	Quotas	Charges 1/	Balances	
			Total	Direct
				Consumption Limits
Short tons, raw value				
Domestic Beet 2/	2,500,000	2,414,996	85,004	-
Mainland Cane 2/	795,000	780,000	15,000	-
Hawaii 2/	1,080,000	1,084,179	0	28,505
Puerto Rico 2/	890,000	904,025	0	56
Virgin Islands 2/	11,000	10,751	249	0
Total Domestic	5,276,000	5,193,951	100,253	28,561
Republic of the Philippines				
Quota	1,085,000	1,075,082	9,918	1,027
Non-quota Purchase	182,401	182,401	0	0
Other foreign countries				
January-June				
Quota	162,538	122,745	4/	0
Non-quota Purchase	1,421,811	1,404,773	4/	0
July-December				
Quota and deficit allocations (details below)	1,269,849 5/	1,215,312	54,691	6,999
Global quota	602,401	597,717	4,684	0
Total other foreign countries	3,456,599	3,340,547	59,375	6,999
Total	10,000,000	9,791,981	169,546	36,587
Details for quota prorated by countries, July-December 1962				
Argentina	10,000	9,757	243	0
Australia	16,534	16,675	0	0
Belgium	91	91	0	0
Brazil	225,865	208,701	17,164	0
British Honduras	0	0	0	0
British West Indies	172,483	171,249	1,234	0
China, Republic of	14,540	14,517	23	0
Colombia	36,147	35,945	202	0
Costa Rica	18,450	17,186	1,264	368
Dominican Republic	316,004	314,968	1,036	0
Ecuador	56,226	50,079	6,147	3
El Salvador	14,471	14,155	316	0
Fiji Islands	4,104	4,104	0	0
French West Indies	31,230	31,052	178	0
Guatemala	28,103	26,354	1,749	3
Haiti	31,875	31,846	29	0
India	8,325	8,325	0	0
Ireland	5,000	4,995	5	5
Mexico	11,635	0	11,635	0
Nicaragua	10,822	10,822	0	6,620
Panama	0	0	0	0
Paraguay	4,104	0	4,104	0
Peru	236,291	236,166	138	0
South Africa	8,325	8,325	0	0
Unallotted	9,224	0	9,224	0
Total	1,269,849	1,215,312	54,691	6,999

^{1/} Domestic Beet and Mainland Cane sugar marketing partly estimated; all other sugar entered, authorized for entry or set aside as of December 31, 1962.

^{2/} Despite deficits declared, full quotas remained available as follows: Domestic beets, 2,795,769; Mainland cane, 944,231; Hawaii, 1,110,000; Puerto Rico, 1,140,000; and Virgin Islands, 15,000.

^{3/} In addition, 333 tons of raw and 21 tons of direct-consumption sugar were brought in for subsequent return to Puerto Rico.

^{4/} Unfilled balance expired June 30, 1962.

^{5/} Basic quotas 493,805 tons and deficit allocations 776,044 tons.

^{6/} Includes raw sugar for direct-consumption from Haiti, 1,130; Puerto Rico, 2,406.

Table 10. - Other foreign countries charges (except Philippines), January 1 - December 31, 1962, Detail for Table

for table

Country or Area	January-June		July 1 to date			Total
	Non-quota	Basic	Country	Allocation	Global	
	Purchase	Quota	Basic	Deficit	Quota	
	Short tons, raw value					
Argentina	0	0	9,757	0	0	9,757
Australia	0	0	16,675	0	131,949	148,624
Belgium	888	91	91	0	793	1,863 ^{1/}
Brazil	79,830	0	73,654	135,047	102,756	391,287
British Honduras	0	0	0	0	0	0
British West Indies	10,404	42	37,375	133,874	0	181,695
Canada	0	316	0	0	3,338	3,654
China, Republic of	52,664	1,901	15,517	0	52,353	121,435
Colombia	29,954	0	12,418	23,527	307	66,206
Costa Rica	8,100	1,896	9,951	7,235	0	27,182
Dominican Republic	430,099	48,550	143,369	171,599	68,240	861,857
Ecuador	0	0	10,011	40,068	16,782	66,861
El Salvador	4,982	0	3,905	10,250	0	19,137
Fiji Islands	4,961	0	4,104	0	6,689	15,754
French West Indies	4,924	0	12,340	18,712	7,730	43,706
Guatemala	4,985	0	7,558	18,796	1,531	32,870
Haiti	1,380	1,156	8,325	23,521	0	34,382
Hong Kong	0	2	0	0	41	43 ^{1/}
India	98,187	0	8,325	0	38,215	144,727
Ireland	4,987	0	4,995	0	0	9,982
Mexico	357,617	39,957	0	0	0	397,574
Mauritius	0	0	0	0	13,475	13,475
Netherlands	3,100	1,970	0	0	2,249	7,319
Nicaragua	30,893	5,578	10,319	503	0	47,293
Panama	2,555	1,219	0	0	0	3,774
Paraguay	0	0	0	0	0	0
Peru	274,263	19,809	78,693	157,473	0	530,238
South Africa	0	0	8,325	0	84,772	93,097
Turkey	0	0	0	0	65,012	65,012
United Kingdom	0	258	0	0	1,484	1,742
West Germany	0	0	0	0	1	1
Total	1,404,773	122,745	474,707	740,605	597,717	3,340,547

^{1/} In addition to quantities shown there is in customs custody 192 tons from Belgium and 10 from Hong Kong.

Table 11. - Quota-exempt sugar^{1/} entered under sections 211 (a) and 212 (4), January 1 - December 31, 1962

Source	For		Total
	Reexport	Feed	
	Short tons, raw value		
Australia	12,296	0	12,296
Belgium	1,208	8,261	9,469
Brazil	3,433	5,045	8,478
Canada	32	342	374
Colombia	590	586	1,176
Costa Rica	0	6	6
Dominican Republic	21,217	17,592	38,809
French West Indies	16,751	606	17,357
Haiti	4,271	0	4,271
Netherlands	295	0	295
Peru	6,971	0	6,971
Reunion	919	0	919
Turkey	377	11,669	12,046
Union of South Africa	1,385	4,899	6,284
United Kingdom	4,008	988	4,996
India	<u>2,589</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>2,589</u>
Total	76,342	49,994	126,336

^{1/} In addition a total of about 539 tons were entered under provisions of Section 212 exempting the first 10 tons and liquid sugar in small containers.

Table 12 - Status of 1963 Quotas and Charges at January 17, 1963

Table 12 - Status of 1965 Quotas and Charges at January 17, 1965			Balances	
Area	Quota	Charges 1/	Total	Direct Consumption Limits
Short tons, raw value				
Domestic Beet	2,698,590	71,000	2,627,590	0
Mainland Cane	911,410	30,000	881,410	0
Hawaii	1,110,000	40,800	1,069,200	33,516
Puerto Rico	1,140,000	1,305	1,138,695	145,695
Virgin Islands	15,000	0	15,000	0
Total Domestic	5,875,000	143,105	5,731,895	179,211
Republic of the Philippines	1,050,000	103,678	946,322	57,779
Details for quota prorated by countries				
Argentina	20,000	0	20,000	0
Australia	40,378	10,836	29,542	0
Belgium	182	182	0	0
Brazil	182,416	0	182,416	0
British Honduras	10,023	0	10,023	0
British West Indies	91,351	0	91,351	0
China, Republic of	35,510	0	35,510	0
Colombia	30,355	0	30,355	0
Costa Rica	25,200	0	25,200	0
Dominican Republic	322,152	22,295	299,857	0
Ecuador	25,200	0	25,200	0
El Salvador	10,309	0	10,309	0
Fiji Islands	10,023	0	10,023	0
French West Indies	30,355	0	30,355	0
Guatemala	20,332	0	20,332	0
Haiti	20,332	0	20,332	0
India	20,332	0	20,332	0
Ireland	10,000	0	10,000	10,000
Mexico	192,152	0	192,152	0
Nicaragua	25,200	0	25,200	0
Panama	15,177	0	15,177	3,817
Paraguay	10,023	0	10,023	0
Peru	192,152	0	192,152	0
South Africa	20,332	0	20,332	0
Global Quota: Authorized for purchase	750,000	113,885	636,115	0
For later authorization	754,341	0	754,341	0
Withheld from Net-importing countries	11,173	0	11,173	0
TOTAL FOREIGN COUNTRIES, EXCLUDING PHILIPPINES	2,875,000	147,198	2,727,802	13,817
GRAND TOTAL	9,800,000	393,981	9,406,019	250,807

1/ Domestic Beet and Mainland Cane sugar marketings partly estimated; all other sugar entered, authorized for entry or set aside as of January 17, 1963.

Table 13 - Foreign Countries Charges* (Excluding Philippines) at January 17, 1963, Detail for table 12

Area	Basic Quota	Global Quota	Total
Short tons, raw value			
Australia	10,836		10,836
Belgium	182		182
Brazil		57,691	57,691
Dominican Republic	22,295	10,816	33,111
South Africa		45,378	45,378
Total	33,313	113,885	147,198

* In addition to quantities shown, there is in Customs Custody one ton Hong Kong and two tons United Kingdom.

Table 14. - Quota-exempt sugar 1/ entered under sections 211 (a) and 212 (4), January 17, 1963

Source	Reexport	Feed	Total
	Short tons, raw value		
Reunion	3,544		3,544
Turkey		5,154	5,154
Total	<u>3,544</u>	<u>5,154</u>	<u>8,698</u>

1/ In addition a total of 86 tons was entered under provisions of section 212; first 10 tons: 84 and liquid sugar in small containers: 2 tons.

Table 15. - Primary distribution of sugar, continental United States, by States, November 1962

State and region	Cane sugar refiners	Beet sugar processors	Importers of direct- consumption sugar	Mainland cane sugar mills	Total
Hundredweights ^{1/}					
New England					
Connecticut	113,354		800		114,154
Maine	48,577				48,577
Massachusetts	428,951				428,951
New Hampshire	28,624				28,624
Rhode Island	41,248		3,280		44,528
Vermont	25,277				25,277
Sub-total	686,031		4,080		690,111
Mid-Atlantic					
New Jersey	664,604		48,047	1,000	713,651
New York	1,419,679	10,933	43,359	460	1,474,431
Pennsylvania	984,824	35,906	62,949		1,083,679
Sub-total	3,069,107	46,839	154,355	1,460	3,271,761
North Central					
Illinois	623,498	924,742		34,413	1,582,653
Indiana	298,255	111,550		1,000	410,805
Iowa	43,577	110,424		2,440	156,441
Kansas	35,691	64,301		300	100,292
Michigan	224,666	250,255			474,921
Minnesota	43,026	130,762		1,000	174,788
Missouri	235,362	156,254	300	2,355	394,271
Nebraska	11,160	113,360		600	125,120
North Dakota	257	21,694			21,951
Ohio	575,515	107,651			683,166
South Dakota	2,938	33,234			36,172
Wisconsin	111,176	151,717			262,893
Sub-total	2,205,121	2,175,944	300	42,108	4,423,473
Southern					
Alabama	208,645		640	630	209,915
Arkansas	79,664	2,000			81,664
Delaware	23,137		465		23,602
District of Columbia	28,681		2,500		31,181
Florida	220,465		30,435	32,024	282,924
Georgia	499,902		1,805		501,707
Kentucky	203,979	1,000		2,076	207,055
Louisiana	289,855			7,647	297,502
Maryland	341,628		19,162		360,790
Mississippi	269,857			1,805	271,662
North Carolina	322,543		5,240	220	328,003
Oklahoma	97,557	14,303			111,860
South Carolina	129,884		660		130,544
Tennessee	287,884		340	8,000	296,224
Texas	560,119	100,533	6,083	1,245	667,980
Virginia	223,180	0	31,474		254,654
West Virginia	67,732	961	390		69,083
Sub-total	3,854,712	118,797	99,194	53,647	4,126,350
Western					
Alaska	4,968	1,350			6,318
Arizona	24,345	21,464			45,809
California	518,922	665,603	31,000		1,215,525
Colorado	9,075	102,696		450	112,221
Idaho	3,880	20,144			24,024
Montana	1,205	24,559			25,764
Nevada	6,835	4,416			11,251
New Mexico	8,954	13,046			22,000
Oregon	49,517	74,258	13,600		137,375
Utah	6,228	43,533		400	50,161
Washington	66,383	124,518	5,392		196,293
Wyoming	627	6,477			7,104
Sub-total	700,939	1,102,064	49,992	850	1,853,845
Grand total	10,515,910	3,443,644	307,921	98,065	14,365,540

1/ Reported as produced or imported and delivered except liquid sugar which is on a sugar solids content basis.

Table 16. - Primary distribution of sugar, continental United States, by States, January-November 1962

State and region	Cane sugar refiners	Beet sugar processors	Importers of direct- consumption sugar	Mainland cane sugar mills	Total
Hundredweights ^{1/}					
New England					
Connecticut	1,220,091		14,311	1,235	1,235,637
Maine	615,871		300		616,171
Massachusetts	4,696,249		21,820	2,329	4,720,398
New Hampshire	355,249		10		355,259
Rhode Island	441,657		26,618		468,275
Vermont	258,347		25,837		284,184
Sub-total	7,587,464		88,896	3,564	7,679,924
Mid-Atlantic					
New Jersey	6,980,536		636,951	1,750	7,619,237
New York	15,778,695	156,252	764,444	5,845	16,705,236
Pennsylvania	10,570,586	83,418	1,135,554		11,789,558
Sub-total	33,329,817	239,670	2,536,949	7,595	36,114,031
North Central					
Illinois	8,457,696	8,993,388	27,724	155,173	17,633,981
Indiana	3,438,957	1,146,093	6,611	1,400	4,593,061
Iowa	500,098	1,486,892	420	10,600	1,998,010
Kansas	392,592	911,259		3,520	1,307,371
Michigan	2,819,667	3,077,741	22,670	600	5,920,678
Minnesota	398,191	1,780,237		6,025	2,184,453
Missouri	2,624,528	1,691,443	4,090	22,805	4,342,866
Nebraska	200,330	1,129,601		4,200	1,334,131
North Dakota	2,100	287,161			289,261
Ohio	6,996,161	1,045,509	63,623	80	8,105,373
South Dakota	25,756	446,028			471,784
Wisconsin	1,237,874	2,054,383	3,045	5,200	3,300,502
Sub-total	27,093,950	24,049,735	128,183	209,603	51,481,471
Southern					
Alabama	2,480,038		19,000	3,260	2,502,298
Arkansas	1,093,712	25,290		20	1,119,022
Delaware	281,188		7,005		288,193
District of Columbia	345,540		44,284		389,824
Florida	2,450,222		956,152	126,235	3,532,609
Georgia	5,228,551		43,695	10,230	5,282,476
Kentucky	2,455,669	1,000	7,116	4,476	2,468,261
Louisiana	3,548,925		562	50,369	3,599,856
Maryland	3,650,261		301,839		3,952,100
Mississippi	1,683,185			9,531	1,692,716
North Carolina	3,636,975		202,934	1,320	3,841,229
Oklahoma	1,183,027	230,304			1,413,331
South Carolina	1,668,750		34,338		1,703,088
Tennessee	3,333,498		3,807	51,346	3,388,651
Texas	6,842,894	1,206,925	52,727	2,988	8,105,534
Virginia	2,382,965	2,800	521,168		2,906,933
West Virginia	891,074	12,793	24,937		928,804
Sub-total	43,156,474	1,479,112	2,219,564	259,775	47,114,925
Western					
Alaska	33,928	17,648			51,576
Arizona	388,192	241,209			629,401
California	7,136,485	9,429,112	208,877	1,000	16,775,474
Colorado	81,576	1,124,634		1,100	1,207,310
Idaho	58,967	297,087			356,054
Montana	23,140	319,219			342,359
Nevada	70,019	57,466			127,485
New Mexico	99,350	170,297			269,647
Oregon	631,067	1,137,766	86,201		1,855,034
Utah	62,417	610,793		400	673,610
Washington	672,888	1,682,583	91,068		2,446,539
Wyoming	6,657	80,469			87,126
Sub-total	9,264,686	15,168,283	386,146	2,500	24,821,615
Grand total	120,432,391	40,936,800	5,359,738	483,037	167,211,966

1/ Reported as produced or imported and delivered except liquid sugar which is on a sugar solids content basis.

Table 17 - Primary distribution of sugar, continental United States, by States, January-November 1962 and 1961

State and region	Cane sugar refiners		Beet processors		Total all Primary Distributors ^{2/}	
	1962	1961	1962	1961	1962	1961
Thousands of hundredweights ^{1/}						
New England						
Connecticut	1,220	1,193			1,236	1,223
Maine	616	650			616	650
Massachusetts	4,696	4,755			4,721	4,783
New Hampshire	355	334			355	334
Rhode Island	442	479			468	495
Vermont	258	275			284	280
Sub-total	7,587	7,686			7,680	7,765
Mid-Atlantic						
New Jersey	6,981	7,144			7,619	7,663
New York	15,779	15,242	156	506	16,705	16,469
Pennsylvania	10,570	10,186	84	556	11,790	11,843
Sub-total	33,330	32,572	240	1,062	36,114	35,975
North Central						
Illinois	8,458	7,503	8,993	9,054	17,634	16,935
Indiana	3,439	2,915	1,146	1,458	4,593	4,381
Iowa	500	559	1,487	1,548	1,998	2,129
Kansas	393	444	911	922	1,307	1,368
Michigan	2,820	2,488	3,078	3,700	5,921	6,196
Minnesota	398	392	1,780	2,005	2,184	2,405
Missouri	2,624	2,482	1,691	1,829	4,343	4,340
Nebraska	200	217	1,130	1,169	1,334	1,393
North Dakota	2	4	287	254	289	259
Ohio	6,996	5,725	1,046	2,464	8,105	8,247
South Dakota	26	31	446	505	472	536
Wisconsin	1,238	1,471	2,054	2,025	3,301	3,523
Sub-total	27,094	24,231	24,049	26,933	51,481	51,712
Southern						
Alabama	2,480	2,632			2,502	2,647
Arkansas	1,094	1,064	25	73	1,119	1,137
Delaware	281	236			288	250
District of Columbia	346	379			390	450
Florida	2,450	2,394			3,533	3,386
Georgia	5,228	5,099			5,282	5,147
Kentucky	2,456	2,347	1	59	2,468	2,451
Louisiana	3,549	3,562			3,600	3,597
Maryland	3,650	3,536		9	3,952	3,878
Mississippi	1,683	1,624			1,693	1,637
North Carolina	3,637	3,309			3,841	3,857
Oklahoma	1,183	1,125	230	316	1,413	1,441
South Carolina	1,669	1,653		*	1,703	1,707
Tennessee	3,333	3,369		42	3,389	3,476
Texas	6,843	6,625	1,207	1,306	8,106	7,990
Virginia	2,383	2,305	3	98	2,907	2,902
West Virginia	891	861	13	28	929	908
Sub-total	43,156	42,120	1,479	1,931	47,115	46,861
Western						
Alaska	34	35	18	16	52	51
Arizona	388	369	241	206	629	575
California	7,137	6,361	9,429	9,673	16,776	16,285
Colorado	82	84	1,125	1,068	1,207	1,152
Idaho	59	45	297	316	356	361
Montana	23	20	319	332	342	352
Nevada	70	61	57	44	127	105
New Mexico	99	103	170	202	270	305
Oregon	631	605	1,138	1,016	1,855	1,734
Utah	62	62	611	590	674	653
Washington	673	638	1,683	1,640	2,447	2,384
Wyoming	7	6	80	90	87	96
Sub-total	9,265	8,389	15,168	15,193	24,822	24,053
Grand total	120,432	114,998	40,936	45,119	167,212	166,366

^{1/} Reported as produced or imported and delivered except liquid sugar which is on a sugar solids content basis.

^{2/} Includes deliveries by importers of direct-consumption sugar and mainland cane sugar mills.

* Less than 500 hundredweights.

Table 18 - Sugar deliveries by type of product or business of buyer and by type of sugar, third quarter, 1962 ^{1/} (Revised January, 1963).

Product or business of buyer	:	:	:	:	:	Liquid sugar included in totals	
	:	Beet	Cane	Imported	Total	:	:
	:	(Total)	(Total)	D.C. (Total)	All sugar		
	:	:	:	:	:	Beet	Cane
Hundredweights ^{2/}							
<u>Industrial</u>							
Bakery, cereal and allied products		1,821,272	3,907,573	161,115	5,889,960	41,357	566,623
Confectionery and related products		1,125,136	2,935,765	148,128	4,209,029	38,966	673,603
Ice cream and dairy products		757,836	1,629,934	22,433	2,410,203	253,500	1,161,353
Beverages		1,506,471	5,764,238	124,898	7,395,607	475,904	3,571,930
Canned, bottled, frozen foods, jams, jellies and preserves		3,479,857	3,291,833	338,604	7,110,294	926,268	2,037,255
Multiple and all other food uses		250,458	1,271,818	92,181	1,614,457	710,422	458,215
Non-food products		12,957	305,144	29,415	347,516	2,200	116,932
Sub-total		8,953,987	19,106,305	916,774	28,977,066	2,448,617	8,585,911
<u>Non-industrial</u>							
Hotels, restaurants, institutions		14,616	314,944	-	329,560	-	16,332
Wholesale grocers, jobbers, sugar dealers		3,097,839	10,361,915	768,744	14,228,498	52,221	71,401
Retail grocers, chain stores, super markets		1,626,881	5,316,578	79,455	7,022,914	11,423	113,882
All other deliveries, including deliveries to Government agencies		152,575	380,135	58	532,768	12,754	109
Sub-total		4,891,911	16,373,572	848,257	22,113,740	76,398	201,724
TOTAL DELIVERIES		13,845,898	35,479,877	1,765,031	51,090,806	2,525,015	8,787,635
Deliveries in consumer-size packages (less than 50 lbs)		3,176,641	12,708,591	209,946	16,095,178		
Deliveries in bulk (unpackaged)		3,482,420	5,184,237		8,666,657		

^{1/} Represents approximately 97.4 percent of deliveries by primary distributors in continental United States.^{2/} Reported as produced or imported and delivered except liquid sugar which is on a sugar solids content basis.

Table 19 - Sugar deliveries, by type of product or business of buyer, third quarter 1962 and percentage change from third quarter 1961. (Revised January, 1963)

Product or business of buyer	: United States	: New England	: Middle Atlantic	: North Central	: South	: West
	:	:	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	:	:	:
	Hundredweights 1/					
<u>Industrial</u>						
Bakery, cereal and allied products	5,889,960	174,678	1,479,094	2,514,224	1,063,354	658,610
Confectionery and related products	4,209,029	327,164	1,891,735	1,332,534	344,094	313,502
Ice Cream and dairy products	2,410,203	121,780	503,664	816,339	596,614	371,806
Beverages	7,395,607	233,728	1,524,779	1,844,362	2,874,788	917,950
Canned, bottled, frozen foods jams, jellies, preserves, etc.	7,110,294	213,758	868,258	1,616,310	798,450	3,613,518
Multiple and all other food uses	1,614,457	35,800	426,938	370,433	116,630	664,656
Non-food products	<u>347,516</u>	<u>6,368</u>	<u>87,248</u>	<u>96,669</u>	<u>155,462</u>	<u>1,769</u>
Sub-total	28,977,066	1,113,276	6,781,716	8,590,871	5,949,392	6,541,811
<u>Non-industrial</u>						
Hotels, restaurants, institutions	329,560	28,331	52,578	41,159	66,809	140,683
Wholesale grocer, jobbers, sugar dealers	14,228,498	632,893	1,825,779	4,598,598	5,075,382	2,095,846
Retail grocers, chain stores super markets	7,022,914	386,967	1,570,641	2,075,181	2,287,060	703,065
All other deliveries, including deliveries to Government agencies	<u>532,768</u>	<u>9,588</u>	<u>61,628</u>	<u>82,065</u>	<u>204,176</u>	<u>175,311</u>
Sub-total	22,113,740	1,057,779	3,510,626	6,797,003	7,633,427	3,114,905
TOTAL DELIVERIES	51,090,806	2,171,055	10,292,342	15,387,874	13,582,819	9,656,716

	Percentage change from third quarter 1961					
<u>Industrial</u>						
Bakery, cereal and allied products	+ 7.9	- 7.3	+ 7.0	+11.9	+ 4.6	+ 5.8
Confectionery and related products	+ 0.6	-18.1	+ 6.3	+ 0.7	- 8.8	+ 3.8
Ice cream and dairy products	- 2.4	- 5.9	-19.0	+ 0.3	+10.4	+ 2.3
Beverages	+ 8.3	- 9.5	- 2.4	+ 3.8	+20.0	+ 9.7
Canned, bottled, frozen foods, jams, jellies, preserves, etc.	+ 0.1	+37.3	-19.0	- 7.0	+12.0	+ 5.5
Multiple and all other food uses	+20.8	+16.0	+21.6	-10.4	-38.5	+89.1
Non-food products	<u>+ 1.1</u>	<u>- 9.3</u>	<u>- 9.5</u>	<u>+35.7</u>	<u>- 7.5</u>	<u>+46.6</u>
Sub-total	+ 4.5	- 4.8	- 1.2	+ 2.5	+10.2	+10.8
<u>Non-industrial</u>						
Hotels, restaurants, institutions	+ 1.8	- 0.8	-26.2	+25.8	+12.3	+ 6.8
Wholesale grocers, jobbers, sugar dealers	- 1.5	- 3.3	- 3.4	- 5.5	+ 2.2	+ 0.9
Retail grocers, chain stores, super markets	- 7.1	- 7.9	-10.3	- 4.3	- 2.9	-18.8
All other deliveries, including deliveries to Government agencies	<u>+ 0.8</u>	<u>+ 4.3</u>	<u>+19.9</u>	<u>- 9.6</u>	<u>+21.2</u>	<u>-16.0</u>
Sub-total	- 3.3	- 4.9	- 6.7	- 5.1	+ 1.1	- 5.1
TOTAL	+ 1.0	- 4.8	- 3.2	- 0.9	+ 4.9	+ 5.1

1/ Reported as produced or imported except liquid sugar which is on a sugar solids content basis.

Table 20. - Corn refiners' shipments, by type of buyer, third quarter 1962 and 1961

Type of buyer	Corn syrup unmixed		Dextrose		All corn sweeteners	
	1962	1961	1962	1961	1962	1961
	Thousand hundredweights, dry basis					
Baking industry	546	465	982	914	1,528	1,379
Confectioners	1,698	1,725	143	117	1,841	1,842
Ice cream and other dairy	536	455	42	49	578	504
Breweries and fountain syrops	332	233	41	40	373	273
Canners, packers, jams, jellies, preserves	1,261	1,108	174	157	1,435	1,265
Miscellaneous food industries including sugar refiners	393	348	352	330	745	678
Syrup mixers <u>1/</u>	134	132	6	6	140	138
Non-food uses	145	133	320	308	465	441
Jobbers, etc.	24	20	54	50	78	70
Subtotal <u>2/</u>	5,070	4,619	2,114	1,969	7,184	6,588
Used in mixed syrups sold by corn refiners	367	378	-	-	367	378
Corn syrup solids and miscellaneous corn sweeteners	263	263	-	-	263	263
Total domestic <u>2/</u>	5,700	5,260	2,114	1,969	7,814	7,229
Export	37	26	20	36	57	62
Grand total <u>2/</u> (Domestic & export)	5,737	5,286	2,134	2,005	7,871	7,291
Bulk Blends <u>3/</u>	308	321	-	-	308	321

1/ Syrup mixers outside of the corn refining industry, except cane sugar refiners and beet sugar processors; the latter two are included with "Miscellaneous food industries".

2/ Due to rounding, totals may not be exact sums of individual items.

3/ According to the Census of Manufacturers 1958, shipments of corn syrup solids were 63.7 percent of total shipments of miscellaneous refinery products. Since corn syrup solids contain up to 3.5 percent moisture, corn syrup solids dry basis, are estimated as 61.5 percent of shipments of miscellaneous refinery products as reported to the Sugar Division. For earlier treatment of this item see Sugar Reports 93, page 6.

4/ Corn syrup unmixed sales to sugar refiners and beet sugar processors for blending contained in miscellaneous food industries.

NOTE: See Sugar Reports, No. 93, January 1960, pages 6-10 for source, methodology and groupings.

Table 21. - Sugar prices

Year and month	: Raw cane sugar-spot prices: :			: Refined beet sugar - quoted wholesale (gross) ^{4/} :			
	: Domestic : "World" : Quota premiums ^{3/} and : :			: Chicago : Pacific :			
	: Sugar at N.Y.: : Sugar ^{2/} : discounts : Eastern : West : Coast :						
	: duty paid ^{1/} :						
Cents per pound							
1957-61 Monthly Average	6.27	3.53	+1.82	8.62	8.67	9.01	
1960 Monthly Average	6.30	3.14	+2.21	8.79	8.77	8.96	
1961 Monthly Average	6.30	2.91	+2.45	8.36	8.59	8.84	
1962							
January	6.45	2.30	+3.23	8.95	8.80	8.80	
February	6.37	2.36	+3.10	8.95	8.80	8.80	
March	6.43	2.65	+2.89	8.95	8.80	8.80	
April	6.43	2.69	+3.86	9.02	8.96	9.00	
May	6.43	2.60	+2.95	9.05	9.00	9.03	
June	6.45	2.63	+2.94	9.10	9.00	9.20	
July	6.39	2.92	+2.59	9.15	9.00	9.20	
August	6.54	3.24	+2.42	9.15	9.00	9.20	
September	6.43	3.18	+2.37	9.15	9.00	9.20	
October	6.52	3.28	+2.35	9.15	9.00	9.20	
November	6.44	3.65	+1.90	9.15	9.00	9.20	
December	6.54	4.29	+1.36	9.12	9.02	9.22	
1962 Monthly Average	6.45	2.98	+2.58	9.07	8.95	9.07	
Year and Month	: Refined Cane Sugar - Quoted Wholesale (Gross) ^{4/} :						: Refined
	: North : South : : Chicago : Pacific : : Retail						: U. S.
	: East : East : : Gulf : West : Coast : : Average						
Cents per pound							
1957-61 Monthly Average	9.32	9.19	9.18	8.86	9.05	11.43	
1960 Monthly Average	9.43	9.40	9.39	8.97	8.96	11.63	
1961 Monthly Average	9.40	9.25	9.23	8.76	8.84	11.77	
1962							
January	9.37	9.06	9.00	9.00	8.80	11.62	
February	9.50	9.10	9.00	9.00	8.80	11.70	
March	9.50	9.10	9.00	9.00	8.80	11.68	
April	9.60	9.20	9.10	9.16	9.00	11.64	
May	9.60	9.20	9.10	9.20	9.03	11.64	
June	9.60	9.20	9.10	9.20	9.20	11.68	
July	9.60	9.20	9.10	9.20	9.20	11.72	
August	9.62	9.12	8.94	9.20	9.20	11.72	
September	9.70	9.20	9.00	9.20	9.20	11.76	
October	9.70	9.20	9.00	9.20	9.20	11.76	
November	9.70	9.20	9.00	9.20	9.20	11.80	
December	9.72	9.22	9.12	9.22	9.22		
1962 Monthly Average	9.60	9.17	9.03	9.15	9.07	11.70 ^{5/}	

^{1/} Spot prices during 1957-60 were for sugar in bags under Contract No. 6 plus .50 cents per pound duty (Cuban). Beginning with 1961, spot prices are for bulk sugar under Contract No. 7, the terms of which are duty paid or duty free.

^{2/} Spot prices during 1957-60 based on No. 4 Contract which was for bagged sugar F.A.S. Cuba. Beginning with 1961 spot prices are those under No. 8 Contract which is also for bagged sugar but F.O.B. and stowed at Greater Caribbean ports (including Brazil).

^{3/} For 1957-60 these amounts are the difference between the spot prices of the No. 6 "Domestic" Contract rolled back to Cuba (minus freight and insurance) and the spot prices of the No. 4 "World" Contract. Beginning with 1961 the No. 7 "Domestic Bulk" Contract has been adjusted by deducting duty (.625¢) computed freight, insurance and unloading charges, and adding the bag allowance (currently .05¢) before calculating the differential from No. 8 "World" Contract spot prices.

^{4/} These are basis prices in 100 pound paper bags, NOT delivered prices. To obtain delivered prices add "Freight Prepay" and deduct discounts and allowances. For illustration see Sugar Reports 81, January 1959, pages 5 to 9.

^{5/} 11-Month Average.

Table 22. - Refined sugar production and month-end stocks

Year and month	Production		Month-end Stocks ^{1/}	
	Cane sugar	Beet	Cane sugar	Beet
	refiners	Processors	refiners	Processors
1,000 short tons, raw value				
1957-61 monthly average	529	189	297	861
1960 monthly average	542	203	312	915
1961 monthly average	553	198	292	932
<u>1962</u>				
January	519	247	296	1,377
February	447	54	302	1,298
March	561	14	244	1,119
April	511	75	267	1,006
May	616	47	280	863
June	692	47	276	687
July	656	47	284	521
August	720	71	238	321
September	591	122	255	186
October	588	584	236	571
November	591	656	264	1,043
December ^{2/}	513	551	257	1,368
1962 monthly average	584	210	267	863

^{1/} Includes over-quota and quota exempt sugar.^{2/} Preliminary.

REFERENCE GUIDE TO SUGAR REPORTS
PUBLISHED DURING 1960, 1961, AND 1962

This index relates to special articles published in Sugar Reports during 1960, 1961 and 1962. It supplements the reference guide in Sugar Reports No. 93, January 1960. Reference numbers are keyed in with those in Sugar Reports No. 93. Regularly recurring statistical data references appear on the title pages of applicable issues of Sugar Reports and are not included in this reference guide.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Sugar Reports No.</u>	<u>Page</u>
D		
I. <u>Directory</u>		
A. Categories, names and principal location of primary sugar distributors		
4. March 1961, including factory locations	107	6-17
II. <u>Distribution</u>		
B. Bulk, packaged, and liquid		
3. 1957-59	100	13-19
4. 1957-60	109	6-12
5. 1961	122	10-17
C. Corn sweeteners		
3. Shipments by type of buyer, quarterly		
January 1956-September 1959	93	6-10

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Sugar Reports</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>Page</u>
H. Trends, seasonals and residuals		
2. Sugar		
d. 1959-60	101	9-15
e. 1960-61	114	4-10
f. 1961-62	126	6-13
J. Weights of consumer-sized packages of sugar, Survey by Food and Drug Administration		
1. 1959	101	15-18

G

I. Government and the Sugar Market

B. Sugar -- Where are we? -- address by Lawrence Myers, Director, Sugar Division	105	6-12
C. 1960 -- A Dramatic year in sugar -- address by Lawrence Myers, Director, Sugar Division	105	13-19
D. Special Study Group on Sugar, Summary Report -- address by Nathan M. Koffsky, Chairman	106	6-12
E. A Sugar Import Fee -- Address by Lawrence Myers, Director, Sugar Division	118	6-15
F. Sixty Years in Sugar -- by C. R. Oviatt	128	5-28
G. Changes and Challenges in Sugar -- Address by Lawrence Myers, Director, Sugar Division	121	16-23

I

Sugar Reports	
<u>No.</u>	<u>Page</u>

II. International Sugar Agreement

F. Statement of Lawrence Myers, Delegate
of the United States of America at the
International Sugar Conference, September
15, 1961

113	-5-9
-----	------

III. Imports

A. Sugar content of products

111	4-12
-----	------

IV. Inventories and Marketing Patterns (See also stocks)

A. Beet Sugar

117	4-7
-----	-----

L

I. Labor productivity on sugar beet and sugarcane
farms in the U. S.

115	19-31
-----	-------

P

III. Prices

F. The "Sugar dollar" from consumer to grower

108	5-19
-----	------

IV. Production

G. U. S. producing and refining areas

107	6-17
-----	------

H. The Possibilities of a Sugar Beet Industry
in Missouri -- Address by Tom O. Murphy,
Deputy Director, Sugar Division

118	16-23
-----	-------

P (cont'd)

	<u>Sugar Reports</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. The Beet Sugar Industry in Perspective for Considering Local Potentials	119	6-18
J. New Peaks in Farm Values for Mainland Sugar Crops	120	4-8

Q

I. Quotas

C. Application of statutory formulas and discretion in allocating non-quota purchase sugar for 1961	111	13-14
---	-----	-------

R

I. Receipts

A. Quota sugar receipts by ports of entry, and areas of origin		
5. 1959	96	18-19
6. 1960 (including non-quota purchases)	108	43-45
7. 1961 (including non-quota purchases)	120	39-40

S

I. Stocks and Movement of Sugar (See also inventories)

A. Bulk shipments of raw sugar from Puerto Rico		
1. 1954-58 (this was indexed in Sugar Reports No. 93 without a sub-number)	83	4-9
2. Notes on	95	7-8

S (cont'd)

	<u>Sugar Reports</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>Page</u>
B. "Invisible" sugar inventories		
2. Industrial users, wholesalers, and retailers		
f. 1959	97	13
g. 1960	109	13
h. 1961	121	24-25
II. <u>Sugar Act</u>		
A. Administration		
3. New Sugar Bowls, address by Lawrence Myers, Director, Sugar Division	103	4-13
4. The Sugar Program at a Crossroad, address by Tom O. Murphy, Deputy Director, Sugar Division	104	6-13
5. Sugar Regulations and Determinations	123	8-10
C. Changes		
1. Proposed in Sugar Act		
c. Administration recommendations to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended	95	6-7
d. Summary	121	4-15
e. Statement of Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture	121	7-12
f. Statement of G. Griffith Johnson, Assistant Secretary of State	121	12-15

S (cont'd)

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Sugar Reports</u>	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>Page</u>
4. 1960 amendments to Sugar Act, Proclamation by the President, and subsequent actions relating to sugar supplies	99 100 102 104	6-21 4-11 8-10 14-20
F. Program		
2. Including changes in 1960 and 1961	115	5-18
3. Including Sugar Act Amendments of 1962	124	5-16
III. <u>Supplies and requirements of Sugar, U.S.</u>		
F. 1959	98	6-13
G. Surplus and Deficit areas	107	6-17
H. Changing pattern of supply sources	110	2
I. 1960	110	6-12
J. 1961	122	4-9
K. Supply Actions in Transition	125	5-9

T

II. TransportationA. Sugar transportation between marketing
territories

1. 1955 (this was indexed in Sugar Reports 93 without a sub-number)	64	7-17
2. 1955-58	95	9-15 18
3. 1958 versus 1955	97	6-12

W

II. D. An 80-year prospective of world sugar	112	5-11
--	-----	------

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service
Washington 25, D.C.

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. Department of
Agriculture

OFFICIAL BUSINESS